

2 November 1973

*STATINTL*

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED]

SUBJECT : Response to the Murphy Commission Letter

ILLEGIB

[REDACTED] 1. The attached unclassified response to the Murphy Commission letter has been agreed to by all four CIA directorates, ASD(I) staff (Al Hall will probably follow their recommendation), and State. Very minor alterations were suggested. ASD(I) staff thought it an excellent tutorial paper, and not only agreed but were "pleased with it." [REDACTED]

ILLEGIB

2. The Commission Staff could make the best use of the statement if they received it on Monday, 5 November. They will send it to the Commissioners to study before the intelligence hearings on 19 and 20 November. The Commissioners have already received a package containing the Murphy to Colby letter of 15 October, a copy of the Colby confirmation testimony, [REDACTED]

STATINTL

[REDACTED] and Harry Howe Ransom's monograph "Strategic Intelligence."

3. A new issue is posed by the fact that the Commission's Deputy Staff Director, Fisher Howe, has changed signals. He has asked for a "comprehensive" classified response to the Murphy letter. This even though the Commission will have a classified transcript of the DCI's remarks, and probably a comprehensive statement from the ASD(I) and from the Director/DIA. It would be very time consuming to produce a classified response, and even more difficult to coordinate it throughout the Community. In fact, a good response could cause friction in the Community. I do not believe that the Commission staff (Fisher Howe mainly) fully appreciates the volume of information they have requested. According to [REDACTED] Howe is worried that something will be held back if he doesn't draw a line and dig in here. For instance, he seems unwilling to accept the suggestion that a series of follow-up questions after the intelligence hearings would focus his inquiry more usefully.

STAT

4. Obviously we do not want to appear reluctant to cooperate with the Commission. I recommend that we send the attached unclassified statement by 5 November. I also recommend that we strongly urge the Commission to ask us follow-up questions, after the intelligence hearings, which are more specific than the present broadside. If we do a classified response to the Murphy letter, I think it should be based upon written contributions from the members of the Community. We should not then try to meet the 19 November deadline, but should take the time to do a careful job.



STATINTL

ILLEGIB

